THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." St. Luke, 2. 14.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1823. NO. 20.

"HE THAT HATH AN EAR, LET HIM HEAR" WHAT THE HEATHEN SAY UNTO THE MISSIONARIES.

BRAMUNICAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE TRINITY.

(Concluded from page 148)

To the fourth objection, the missionary editor gives, as the Bramun says, "an evasive answer," which is this; "Christians worship Jesus Christ, and not his body separately from him." The native is not to be satisfied in this manner. "I never charged Christians," he replies, "with worshipping the body of Jesus Christ separately from himself. The Editor in fact confesses their adoration of Jesus Christ as the very God in the material form; nevertheless he attempts to maintain that they worship God in spirit." This inhabitant of a heathen land then goes on with some remarks, which are as sound, and just, and spiritual, as if he had been instructed from his childhood in the worthiest conceptions of the only one living and true God.

"If we admit that the worship of spirit, possessed of material body, is worship in spirit, we must not any longer impute idolatry to any religious sect; for none of them adore mere matter, unconnected with spirit. Did the Greeks and Romans worship the bodies of Jupiter and Juno, and their other supposed gods, separately from their respective spirits? Are not the miraculous works, ascribed by them to these gods, proofs of their viewing them as spirits connected with the body? Do the idolators among Hindoos worship the assumed forms of their incarnations, divested of their spirit? Nothing of the kind. Even in worshipping idols, Hindoos do not consider them objects of worship until they have performed *Pranprutistha*, or communication of divine life. According to the definition given by the Editor, none of them can be supposed idolators, because they never worship the body separately from the spirit. *But in fact, any worship, through either an artificial form, or imaginary material representation, is nothing but idolatry.*"

Now we must say, and we do not wish to appear uncharitable, that the Hindoo seems to us to understand the meaning and spirit of the *second commandment*, far better than the Christian.

The argument on the fifth objection is short, and we shall extract it entire. It shows either a real or affected misapprehension on the one side, and considerable ingenuity and readiness on the other.

"My fifth question was, 'How can equality subsist except between objects possessed of different essences and existences?' But the Editor repeats only a part of it, that is, how the Son can be equal with the Father, when he does possess the same nature; and then declares the question unintelligible. I never meant the impossibility of equality between persons or things that possess the same nature: as we find often equality in some property subsisting between man and man, though possessing the same nature.—But as no equality can subsist except between things of different *existences*, and the professed belief of the missionary gentlemen was, that the Son is the same in existence, as well as in nature, with the Father, I took the liberty to ask, how the Son can be equal with the Father, when he is supposed to be possessed of the same *nature* and *existence*. Unless they deny to the Son the same existence with the Father, they cannot, I think, maintain his equality with the Father. I therefore presume my question is perfectly intelligible"

Our readers will, by this time, have formed an opinion of the ability, which is now opposing the unintelligible doctrines presented to the Hindoos as Christianity. The missionaries have a new work on their hands. It is learning, and not ignorance; reason, and not superstition, with which they have now to contend; and if we are not mistaken, they will find the present the harder task of the two. They are not now engaged with an unenlightened tribe of savages, who can be made to believe any thing by those, whose superior knowledge, virtues, and power, they are compelled to respect, and whose doctrines are all the better to them for being mysterious. They are opposed by a well-informed and influential class of theists, who are able to examine every proposition, and who seem determined not to resign their own views till they can obtain better in exchange. Of this state of things, the missionaries appear to be wilfully ignorant. If we may judge from the following remarks of the writer, whose argu-

ments we have been repeating, they plod on in the accustomed track, and talk in the same way to a people, who, as we have been informed, have seven native printing presses at work, as they would to a race of absolute barbarians.

"I cannot help feeling compassion for his total want of knowledge of the literary employment, and domestic conduct of the native community at large, notwithstanding his long residence in India. During only a few years past, *hundreds of works* on different subjects, such as Theology, Law, Logic, Grammar, and Astronomy, have been written *by the natives of Bengal alone* I do not wonder that they have not reached the knowledge of the Editor, who, in common with almost all his colleagues, has shut his eyes against any thing that might do the smallest credit to the natives."

And then with regard to the proper spirit and manner of conducting a controversy, it will not be difficult to determine, after we have read the concluding paragraphs of this number of the Magazine, which of the two parties entertains the most dignified and liberal views, the missionary or the native

"As to the abusive terms made use of by the Editor, such as 'Father of lies alone, to whom it (Hindooism) evidently owes its origin,' 'impure fables of his false gods:—'Pretended gods of Hindoos,' &c. common decency prevents me from making use of similar terms in return. *We must recollect, that we have engaged in solemn religious controversy, and not in exercising abuse against each other.*

"I conclude this reply with expressing my hope that the Editor, on noticing it, will arrange his observations methodically giving an answer to each of my five questions in succession; that the public may judge with facility of the arguments employed on both sides."

One circumstance will not fail to strike any one, who is versed in the trinitarian controversy, as worthy of peculiar remark.—He will remember, that long essays, and even large books, have been written, to prove that some remains of a Trinity existed among the superstitions of the east He will remember, too, that engravings have been inserted in these books, representing ugly and monstrous idols, with one body and three heads. And then he will remember, that the sagacious authors of these books have gone on to infer a strong argument for the truth of the trinitarian doctrine, from the existence of these wild notions, and three headed images; it not once crossing their minds, that these forms of idolatry existed long before the introduction of Christianity, and that they might therefore have been one cause of the trinitarian corruption of Christianity. Well, he now sees this same argument turned *against* a body of Christian missionaries, by the better informed portion of that self same people, from whose vulgar superstitions the argument was first drawn. He sees a Brahmun comparing a missionary to certain idolaters of his nation, for that similarity of faith, which had been considered by Christian authors as so remarkably fortunate. We regard this as a singular fact.

But all these Brahmunical arguments against the Trinity are arguments from reason alone. The Christian Scriptures themselves are not adduced: and the missionaries may still intrench themselves, and their doctrines, behind the strong external evidence for the divine, and therefore decisive authority of these writings One native, however, has come forward, and examined the Bible itself: and while he sees and acknowledges its truth and divinity, he is convinced that it does not authorise, nor countenance, the dogmas of Trinitarianism. He is thus enabled to oppose the missionaries with the weapons both of reason and revelation.

This native is Rommohun Roy. By the force of his intellect, he has not only thrown off the shackles of his early faith, but has discovered the true form of another, which was presented to him metamorphosed and disguised. From his learning and judgment we are led to expect the most favourable influences on the minds of his countrymen, and to regard him as an important instrument in the spread of pure Christianity.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

TO THE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Dear Brethren,—It is with sensations which I do not recollect ever to have experienced, that I write this letter. It is well known to many of you, that for more than seven years, I had the honor of being an acceptable member of your communion. I commenced the study of theology some years ago with the sole object of making myself useful to the Methodist connexion; but my investigations have led me to reject what you consider the *marrow* of the gospel. I was very willing to believe (in divinity) all that you required of me; but I could not believe without evidence; and it is little more than a year, since I have given up all expectation of obtaining it.

I always doubted the doctrine of endless *misery*; but thought it might be true; and

that my unbelief proceeded from ignorance: for I thought so many, whom I esteemed as *Ministers and Fathers* in the Church were certainly right, and heartily wished myself like them

While I was assisted and directed in my theological studies I was without a guide or prepossessions in philosophy; and my mind, ever on the stretch to solve the various phenomena, which I saw surround me, at length dispelled the darkness, & led me to certain and inevitable conclusions, which I very soon perceived. I could never reconcile to what I had been taught was true in divinity. I knew very well that what was false in philosophy could not be true in theology — Such, however, was my affection for you, my brethren, that I resolved not to leave you: and to avoid being expelled, I thought of studying medicine, and was on the very eve of laying aside all ideas of continuing in the ministry, when I found I could not reconcile it to my conscience: and that as I was a citizen of the world, I was responsible for my conduct, to a higher tribunal than a sectarian platform of faith; and that I ought to act from a higher motive than merely the opinions or *feelings* of the wisest or most pious of my religious friends. — I have no intention of impeaching the motives by which I think a large majority of you are actuated—I do think you sincere, and if it were in my power I would still live on terms of christian friendship with you, but I have good reason to believe it will be impossible, except in a few instances. It is true, I think early prejudices keep you from the truth: but I make a difference between an error of the head and one of the heart,—honesty being all that is essential to goodness.

As I had never read any Universalist books nor heard any preaching till I espoused the doctrine, you will easily perceive that reason and the scriptures were my only guide. I can truly say (and I believe you who are acquainted with me, will not doubt it) that it has been my anxious desire and prayer, to know and understand the truth. I am unable to say what I may believe hereafter; but this I can say, that I *now as firmly* believe that all mankind will be restored to holiness and happiness, as I believe that they will exist after the death of the body. Indeed I believe that what is called orthodoxy, is well calculated to make *sceptics* — Beginning with the church of Rome, and passing through the various grades of orthodoxy down to Universalism.—I really think the more orthodox the worse, and the more heterodox the better, till we arrive to the last mentioned doctrine, which alone is consistent with the whole tenor of the scriptures and common sense. I have not embraced the doctrine of the final happiness of all men, without the strongest conviction of its *truth*; nor rejected the doctrine of endless misery, but from a full conviction that it cannot be supported by any fair interpretation of the scriptures, or by any course of logical reasoning from the justice, goodness, wisdom and power of the Deity. Believing as I do in the truth of the scriptures, and having *no doubt* that they teach in the most positive manner the doctrine of Universal Salvation; I feel myself bound by the most solemn and sacred obligations, to use my utmost influence (however small,) to diffuse its light among my fellow men. As I believe nothing can be more laudable in public teachers, than to disseminate what they conscientiously think the Truth, I shall always respect an honest zeal in those from whom I differ; and all I ask is "that mercy I to others show."

TRUTH alone is my object, and truth has nothing to fear from a contrast with error, or the closest investigation. If you are in an error, my brethren (and who knows that you are not) it is to your own advantage to be convinced of it; and as I certainly think you are, you will not take it ill in me, in pointing out to you in a candid manner, what I consider the most exceptionable part of your system and articles of faith. 1. Let me ask those of you, who are versed in the New-Testament, and Church History, if you have any authority for Episcopacy.— You cannot be ignorant that the primitive Churches chose their own pastors. "One is your Master *even* Christ,"—Are ye not then all brethren? Is not Episcopacy an appendage of Monarchy; and every way unworthy a free and enlightened people? 2. What are the qualifications you require in those you authorize to preach? If a young man entirely ignorant of the scriptures, and every species of literature, except being barely able to read and write, be operated upon in a reformation; and in the moment of his religious excitement fancies himself called to preach; if he can speak fluently, is he not sent forth to teach mankind without any other reason to offer, why they should believe, than that they will be damned if they don't; and who knows of no other way by which men can become virtuous, but by passing through the same animal and mental excitement they themselves experienced? After a young man is thus taken on a *circuit*, what opportunity has he of getting knowledge? It is true, that some who have a thirst for learning, which nothing can remove, obtain much general information

but of your thousands of preachers in the United States, where are your respectable authors? Is not your whole system unfriendly to literature? What opportunity can men have for study, whose every moment is occupied in travelling, preaching, and visiting from house to house? Is it not an opinion among you, that your most ignorant preachers are the most useful in getting up awakenings? How often have I heard it said, that such and such preachers had lost their usefulness, when no other reason could be assigned, than that they had become dispassionate, and had laid aside that fiery zeal and positiveness, by which their first preaching was characterized! I ask this serious question, is not your form of Church government calculated to impede the growth of the mind? Who among you dare publish a book, without the consent of the Conference?—and who rules the Conference?—Who dare preach a sermon without consulting the discipline more than the Bible?—What room can there be for improvement while every preacher is bound by the same chain, and no one dares for a moment to call in question the infallibility of the Discipline? Have not all the exertions of those, who wished well to science, and who tried their utmost to establish Seminaries among you proved unavailing, and can you not discover the real cause?

I know you say, the Lord does not seem to prosper your schools, which has been the fact from the days of Mr. Wesley, and which it is to be feared always will be with your present regulations.

In order to shut heresy out of the Church, do you not shut out knowledge? Who among you read Unitarian or Universalist publications? And if any of your church members do read them, and speak of them in terms of approbation, are they not immediately suspected of heresy, and treated coolly? Is not the theological Library at Newmarket watched with a jealous eye: A little work entitled the ERRORS OF METHODISM, containing some friendly advice to those who are in the habit of disturbing their peaceable brethren by their SHOUTS in time of worship (although written *by a Wesleyan Methodist.*) could not peaceably remain. Was it not determined to exclude Priestley's discourses. You very justly complain of the illiberality of some of the Calvinists, but what would be thought of the Professors at Andover, if they were to exclude from their Library Universalist, Unitarian, Arminian, or even Deistical books? Truth can never be in any real danger, for God is its Author and Supporter.—Who has any thing to fear from storms, whose house is built on a rock? A man may well tremble if he stands on a sandy foundation, but it is to his own advantage to be made sensible of his danger. I shall endeavor in a future number to point out in a tender manner as possible some errors in your articles of faith.

ELIPHALET CASE.

Extract from the writings of the HON. ZEPHANIAH SWIFT, *of Connecticut.*

"To obtain the full benefit of Religion, it is necessary that public worship should be conducted in an agreeable manner. In this respect there is unquestionably much room for improvement.

It might rationally have been concluded from our Saviour's pointed disapprobation of long prayers, that Ministers would have universally studied brevity in their religious excercises, especially when he sets them an excellent example in his prayer, which exhibits an inimitable specimen of conciseness, sublimity and comprehension. But how many are there who lengthen out their discourses in such a manner as to agonize the feelings, and wear out the patience of their unhappy audience. It is the duty of every minister to attempt a brevity in religious discourses and exercises, which is coincident with the feelings of human nature. Such is our constitution, that we cannot attend closely to any subject for a great length of time, without suffering fatigue, and growing impatient. The preaching of an angel to an audience that is weary and impatient would produce no good effect. It is nothing but labor lost, and time misspent, to attempt to counteract these natural feelings. Nor can it answer any valuable purpose, for it is not the length, but the ardor and sincerity of our devotion, that will make it acceptable to God. The frequent return of religious exercises renders it necessary that they should be rendered concise, pleasing and entertaining, to catch and invite the attention of the audience. There can be no impropriety in a minister's availing himself of the natural propensities of the human heart to instil the principles of religion into it. But to lengthen discourses in such an unreasonable manner as to create disgust and aversion, is prejudicial to the interests of religion, because it drives mankind from the performance of the most agreeable and important duty, by exhibiting it unnecessarily in an unamiable and frightful form.

It is however, with great pleasure that I observe that some ministers of worth and respectability have innovated upon this puritanical custom, and preach sermons of

reasonable and proper length. The general approbation of the practice, I hope will not only induce them to continue it, but induce all the ministry to adopt it. How rare are the complaints that a sermon is too short, but many and dismal are the complaints about long sermons.

It would be of inconceivable advantage to religion, if ministers would pay more attention to the cultivation of eloquence and oratory. There are some gentlemen of that profession, who have acquired deservedly great reputation as orators, and their success and influence ought to induce others to imitate their praise-worthy example.—The Christian system furnishes the orator with the richest, most copious and sublimest topics of eloquence. Who can, with indifference, contemplate the ineffable glories of the Supreme Deity—the Creator of the Universe, and the Author of all Good!—The undiscribably amiable character of our Saviour, the angelic purity of his doctrines, and his meritorious death, by which he opened the prospect of eternal life, furnish infinitely nobler subjects of elegance than were handled by the great orators of Athens and Rome. Demosthenes and Cicero. The minister may range through the wide field of ecclesiastical history, select the most interesting events for animated description and from the delightful science of morals he may cull the brightest flowers, and weave the fairest wreathes of eloquence. But amid this unbounded variety of the noblest subjects, we find the pulpit is too generally the theatre of unanimated description, uninteresting exhortation, and lifeless declamation. Sermons are too often a cold unvaried round of common place topics, a dry repitition of thread-bare sentiments, familiar to every old woman, presented in every possible shape, and expressed in every possible mode of dulness, to spin out the discourses to ordinary length, to consume the common period of time, and to inflict the usual anguish on the patience of the unhappy auditory.

Ministers should not dwell much upon the controversial points of Divinity. To explain and enforce the practical duties, will be of far greater utility. A steady contemplation of these duties, which all denominations agree to be the constituent principles of christianity, will unite them in brotherly love and charity, and prevent that discord and dissention which have been so prejudicial to the interest of religion and humanity.

Public worship, when conducted with propriety, may be rendered infinitely delightful and interesting. Imagine a society of Christians, convened for public worship, with a minister who possesses all the social virtues that can render him amiable as a man, and a liberal share of genius, eloquence, and science, to render him respectable as a preacher. He addresses the Throne of Grace, and the Fountain of Mercy, in a concise prayer, that inspires the hearts of his hearers with love and gratitude to the benevolent Author of their existence. In his sermons are no attempts to wound feelings, or weary the patience of his audience. When he contemplates the character of the Sovereign of the Universe, he does not dress him in terrors to frighten women and children; he represents him as the Father of the human race, who delights to diffuse the highest possible happiness among all the works of his hands. He paints in the most enchanting colors, the excellency of religion, and the beauty of virtue. He aims to animate to a pursuit of heavenly things, by exciting a love of God in their bosoms; and he never attempts to frighten them to heaven by the most tremendous description of the abyss of hell, and the torments of the damned. Fear and terror are not the flowers of rhetoric, to ornament and enliven his discourses; but love and gratitude are the perpetual theme of his contemplations. Such religious excercises accompanied by good devotional music, constitute a heaven on earth. To attend such worship, all will have the strongest inducement, and such an agreeable mode of paying that adoration, we owe to our Creator, in company with our friends and neighbors, is the sublimest and nobiest employment of the soul.

THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1823.

FOR THE HERALD.

Mr. Editor,

Dear sir—My question respecting your authority to preach the gospel has not been answered to my understanding either scripturally, historically or strictly candidly.—Universalist says he presumes, or it is probable that I know from whence you argue your pretensions, and says he is willing to investigate the subject; that is what I wish (viz.) to have the subject of apostolic ordination fairly elucidated unconnected with any other questions. Universalist says the real authority to preach the gospel is the knowledge of the truth connected with a desire and a capacity to communicate it;—that being the case, what need of ordination at all? he appeals to history to prove

the rapacious villany of the clergy, but not to prove his authority to the priesthood, which was established both under Moses and Christ's dispensations and have both been invaded by those pretenders who climb or wish to climb up some other way into it than by the door. Now if you pretend to ordination, please trace it to its origin or i is of no consequence—now just please investigate this subject with gospel sparity.

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

REPLY.

Our correspondent has not denied any fact we have stated. (See no. 18) nor has he controverted any position we have taken—he says "my question has not been answered to my understanding"—but he has not explicitly stated what his understanding does require on the subject. According to this mode of proceeding, were our answers ever so elaborate and conclusive, and our quotations from Scripture and History, ever so abundant: our correspondent might repeatedly say, "my question has not been answered to my understanding."—and after charging us with want of candour, repeat his question. He says his question has not been answered "*strictly candidly*" This assertion is unaccompanied with any evidence whatever We consider a want of candour to be a direct violation of the plainest precepts of the gospel of Christ—and if we should inadvertently fail to exercise this exalted christian virtue, we should esteem *correction* to be the work of friendship and fairfulness, and we should ever consider it a duty to make due acknowledgements: but we would thank our correspondent to practice so much *civility* as not to charge us with being *unandid* without accompanying such charge with some *appearance* of support.

Our Catholic correspondent wishes to have the subject "elucidated, unconnected with any other questions" He probably finds that it is sometimes easier to *ask*, than to *answer* questions. Notwithstanding our correspondent as yet declines answering any questions on the subject, still we wish to answer him satisfactorily if possible; if we should fail to do it satisfactorily, we shall aim to do it *incontrovertibly*; for we are much better pleased with the process of *reasoning* with "A Roman Catholic," on the subject of religion; than we should be of suffering imprisonment, torture, flames and death for HERESY at the nod of the "SOVEREIGN PONTIFF" of Rome! The latter would be our fate if we were in certain catholic countries!

Our correspondent says "the priesthood was established, both under Moses and Christ's dispensations, and have both been invaded by those PRETENDERS who climb, or wish to climb up some other way into it than by the door." Pray Sir where is your authority for making the outward ceremony of ordination the door into the ministry? Where is your authority for denying any man the privilege of communicating gospel truth, during his whole life, without having received ordination; if he can be useful, and community be pleased to encourage his labours?

Christ says "I am the door:" (i. e. into his spiritual kingdom) "by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture" St. John 10 9—He also says "Neither be ye called masters; *for one is your* MASTER, even Christ." St. Math. 23. 10. The above confirms what we have before advanced viz. that the real authority to preach the gospel, is the knowledge of the truth, connected with a desire and a capacity to communicate it. We consider ordination reasonable and proper as a public acknowledgement of the candidate as a Labourer in the ministry: but his ordination neither adds to, nor diminishes any thing from his communications. Hence it is that men are not bound to receive the unscriptural and unsupported statements of even an *ordained* preacher!

If by ordination our Correspondent means to confer upon a Preacher the right to enforce all he says upon pain of damnation, we say there is no need of it. But if by ordination he means the selection, appointment or reception of a candidate as a minister of the gospel, he has yet to show that the power of ordination does not lie "in the suffrage of the people" according to the doctrine of the INDEPENDENTS.

It is quite as necessary that we should understand the nature, as that we should understand the *origin* of ordination.

We object to the Catholic idea of ordination because the Divines of the church of Rome thereby enforce IMPLICIT FAITH to all they teach. They say "that we are to observe, not how the church proves any thing, but what she says That the will of God is, that we should believe and confide in his ministers in the same manner as himself!" Cardinal Cusanus says "that irrational obedience is the most consummate and perfect obedience, when we obey *without* attending to *reason, as a beast* obeys his driver!' In his epistle to the Bohemians, he says "When the church changes her judgment, *God changes his judgment likewise*"!!! Surely all those

who can receive such sentiments, can also have a "driver!"

The *origin* of ordination under the christiandispensation was the appointment of certain persons as preachers by our Saviour. "And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach" &c. St. Mark 3,14.

Christ has never informed us that the efficacy of his word and ordinances depends upon the *uninterrupted succession* of any office whatever—if he had, how could we trace such succession through 1800 years?

As to the *Imposition of Hands*, nothing can be more evident than that no virtue is thus magically communicated: for this was a Jewish ceremony introduced by custom and not by divine appointment. Christ observed this custom and added prayer to it. And we are informed that the Apostles underwent the imposition of hands anew every time they entered upon any new design. "In the ancient church, imposition of hands was even practiced on persons when they married, which custom, the Abyssinians still observe".

We shall close our remarks in the language of an eminent Author, "Since there are some texts in the New-Testament, wherein single persons, either Apostles, as Paul and Barnabas, ordained ministers in the churches: or evangelists, as Timothy and Titus, and since other missions or ordinations are intimated to be performed by several persons, viz. prophets, teachers, elders or a presbytery, as in Acts 13 1 and 1 Tim. 4 14 Since there is sometimes mention made of the imposition of hands in the mission of a minister, and sometimes no mention of it, and since it is evident that in some cases popular ordinations are and must be valid, without any bishop or elder. I think none of these differences should be made a matter of violent contest among christians." "All may agree that numerous forms or modes, seeming to be used in the mission or ordination of ministers in primitive times, may give a reasonable occasion or colour for sincere and honest searchers after truth to follow different opinions on this head, and do therefore demand our candid and charitable sentiments concerning those who differ from us."

From the Gospel Advocate.

A Discourse on Demonology, or doctrines of Devils, by the Rev J. S. THOMPSON.

1 Tim 4 1.—"*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of Devils.*"

How deplorable is the state of the human mind, degraded by superstition. Fear being the mother of superstition, we may reasonably expect her gods to be hideous and terrific. Hence an imaginary Devil has obtained the greatest veneration in many countries of Asia and Africa. And even at this time, however incredible, his worship is very prevalent throughout all christendom. Being the popular god of modern superstition, if any independent man, who dares to think, expresses a doubt of his existence, the alarm is sounded, and fearing that the empire of the god of this world is about to be upset, all who wander after the *beast*, hasten to cry out for whole hours, great is the Devil whom we adore! Be not surprised, the existence and influence of the devil are as necessary to the creeds of modern times, as the honors of Diana to the craftsmen of Ephesus! Among the various objects of blinded nations' fear, the ghosts of departed heroes were admitted at a very early period. It was imagined by weak and perverted minds, that men who had distinguished themselves, in this world, by either good or evil actions, would retain their dispositions in the next; and be actively engaged in promoting the welfare of mankind, or plotting their ruin, as far as those propensities excited, or their influence extended. Therefore, men became naturally inclined to honor the good spirits for their services, and offer sacrifices to the evil, to placate their malevolence! Hence Plato and many other eminent philosophers taught that all intercourse between the Deity and mankind was carried on by means of demons, who ought on that account to receive divine homage. This doctrine was received by many of the heathen nations, and even by many of the Jews, especially the Essens, who believed that thousands of these demons officiated as mediators with Jehovah, and therefore ought to be worshipped. It was also a general opinion, that acute diseases, plagues, apoplexies, epilepsies, &c were operated by demons, or ghosts of wicked men, who entered the human bodies and destroyed those who were not powerfully supported by the good demons. Accordingly we find, that in all the passages of scripture, which speak of persons possessed of devils, the original word is *daimon* and not *diabolos* which should not therefore have been translated devil, nor devils. But it appears to have been an early and much agitated question among the philosophers, whence sprang that moral and physical evil which so often weakens the enjoyment and destroys the happiness of mankind

To be continued.

POETRY.

SELECTED.

INFANCY AND MATURE AGE.

AN APOLOGUE.

("Men are but children of a larger growth.")

'Twas eight o'clock, and near the fire
My ruddy little boy was seated,
And with the title of a sire
My ears expected to be greeted—
But vain the thought!—by sleep oppress'd,
No father there the child descried;
His head reclined upon his breast,
Or nodding, roll'd from side to side.

"Let this young rogue be sent to bed"—
More I had not had time to say,
When the poor urchin rais'd his head
To beg that he might longer stay
Refus'd; towards rest his steps he bent
With tearful eye, and aching heart;
But claim'd his playthings ere he went
And took up stairs his horse and cart.

For new delay, though oft denied,
He pleaded; wildly crav'd the boon;—
Though past his usual hour, he cried
At being sent away so soon.
If stern to him, his grief I shar'd;
(Unmov'd who hears his offspring weep?)
Of soothing him I half despair'd;
When all his cares were lost in sleep.

"Alas! poor infant!" I exclaim'd,
"Thy father blushes now to scan,
In all which he so lately blam'd,
The follies and the fears of man."
"The vain regret, the anguish brief,
Which thou hast known, sent up to bed,
Portrays of man the die grief,
When doom'd to slumber with the dead,"

And more I thought—When up the stairs
With "longing lingʼring looks" he crept,
To mark of man, the childish cares,
His playthings carefully he kept.
Thus mortals on life's later stage,
When nature claims their forfeit breath,
Still grasp at wealth, in pain and age,
And cling to golden toys in death.

'Tis morn! and see my smiling boy
Awakes to hail returning light;
To fearless laughter! boundless joy!
Forgot the tears of yesternight!
Thus shall not man forget his woe?
Survive of age, and death the gloom?
Smile at the cares he knew below?
And renovated burst the tomb?

O, my Creator! when thy will
Shall stretch this frame on earth's cold bed,
Let that blest hope sustain me still,
Till thought, sense, memʼry—all are fled.
And grateful for what Thou may'st give,
No tear shall dim my fading eye,
That 'twas thy pleasure I should live—
That 'tis thy mandate bids me die.

TO THE REV. JASON LATHROP.

SIR.—In a letter to the "Editor of the Herald of Salvation," you deny ever having said that "the devil made and first preached the creed of the Universalists." You do dot deny having printed this charge in a Book, but simply say the charge was made by the theory of the open communion doctrine.

I wish now to submit a few questions to you, and hope you will fairly answer them.

1. Do you, or do you not entertain the above opinion of the Universalists' creed?

2. If the devil did not make their (the Universalists') creed, who did?

3. Will you be so kind as to state the reason why you are opposed to Universalism?

4. From whose writings did you quote the words, To the Universalists, "Your creed was made and first taught by the devil in paradise, and is still propagated by his ministers?"

If you will condescend to answer these questions you will greatly oblige.

Yours &c.
GEORGE B. LISHER.

Little Falls, Aug. 6. 1823.

N. B. Mr. Lathrop is informed that in consequence of several days absence at the time, and after his letter was published, this reply has been necessarily delayed.

G B L

OBITUARY.

DIED, in Henderson, on the 5th inst. after a lingering illness borne with christian resignation, Mrs. *Ruth Alger*, wife of Mr. George Alger. Exemplary in life, she died as she had lived, in the faith of the salvation of the human race through the infinite mercy of God.

In this village, on the 14th inst. Mrs. *Rebecca Thompson*, aged 21 years.

On the 15th inst. Mr. *John Barker*, aged 26 years.

NOTICE.

The stated church conference of the Unitarian Church of Hou sfield and adjacent Towns is to be holden at the Meeting House in S. Harbor on the 2 Saturday in September next at one o'clock P. M. All the male member's of said church are earnestly solicited to attend on said day by request of the aggrieved members of said church

Signed in behalf of said aggrieved members.

A. Wood Elder.

Dated Sackets Harbor August 14 h 1823.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

*****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.